DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 643 JC 770 454

AUTHOR Williams, Ruthann E.
TITLE Presidential Evaluation.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Bibliographies; *Chief Administrators; College Administration; Community Colleges; Evaluation; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Junior Colleges; Literature Reviews; *Presidents; State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

The interest in and need for presidential evaluation has arisen from the increased size and complexity of institutions, the call for accountability, the increasing difficulty of the presidential task, and the shift in roles and responsibilities of the presidency. Presidential evaluation provides an institution with the opportunity to delineate carefully the roles, responsibilities, and expectations for its chief executive officer, and allows the president to clarify his/her own goals. Criteria for evaluation should include the areas of leadership, academic planning and internal administration, decision-making and problem-solving, institutional representation, and personal qualities. Possible evaluation methods include the use of an internal or external "fact-finder," ad-hoc committees, self-assessment, or an internal feedback system. Rating scales, developed from agreed upon criteria, should be used. The president's self-assessment can use the same scales, or can take a narrative form which includes his goals, administrative style, major issues confronting the institution, and strategies for goal achievement. A bibliography is appended. (RT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144643

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ruthann E. Williams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PRESIDENTIAL EVALUATION

Ruthann E. Williams
Department of Higher Education
SUNY at Buffalo

JC 770 454

PRESIDENTIAL EVALUATION

The evaluation and development of college and university administrators have become a very significant issue in Higher Education. There is growing evidence of interest throughout the United States in the more formal evaluation of college and university administrative leadership, and a broader acceptance of the need for their continued professional development. American Association for Higher Education's recent Research Currents included an extensive review on the state of the art (Fisher, 1977). In the past several months, numerous conferences and workshops, concerning administrative evaluation and development, have been conducted around the country. AAHE and the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges sponsored a three-day retreat in February, 1977, in Washington, D. C., and the American Association of University Administrators conducted two regional conferences on administrative evaluation. Now that the conscious level of Higher Education has been raised, it is essential to turn to the development of effective assessment programs, which have as their primary purpose, improved performance of college and university administrators.

Administrative evaluation, which includes the evaluation of the president of a college or university, is an extension of the interest and work that has been done in student evaluation (1960's), faculty evaluation (1970's), and overall institutional assessment. Although not universally accepted, administrators are now being asked to participate in developing evaluative frameworks, and to suggest criteria which could be used to determine their success in reaching previously stated objectives.

Evaluation of people and institutions is not a new phenomena. The informal evaluation, the day to day assessment of performance has historically been done outside the context of written policy, and in the absence of well developed procedures (Hayes, 1977). Formalized evaluation will never replace, but will complement the already existing informal evaluation, and stabilize the total process (G. Lester Anderson, 1975). If the vitality and health of individual institutions are to be maintained, Higher Education's continued lag behind business and industry, in the assessment and development of its managers must be addressed.

WHY EVALUATE?

Presidential evaluation can be costly in time, energies, and excessive expectations. It can be threatening to both the person being evaluated, and the institution. It is essential, therefore, for an institution to weigh carefully the benefits of presidential assessment against the negative results that can occur. A study group at the University of Illinois, sponsored by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, concluded that the value of formal, systematic, and continuing presidential assessment outweighed substantially, the costs and negative results of such a process, if the assessment is sensibly structured and sensitively administered (1974). The benefits that accrue to both the institution and the individual president, are well worth the efforts.

With the growth of Higher Education, the increased size and complexity of colleges and universities, the changing nature of their missions, and the call for accountability, it has become necessary for institutions to have better defined institutional goals and objectives, a periodic review of their leadership needs, more objective assessments of their productivity and progress, clearer identification of

management areas that need modification, and a more systematic approach to addressing those areas in which improvement would appear to be warranted. In light of shrinking enrollments and fiscal restraints, good stewardship is essential to the vitality of an institution.

The average tenure of college presidents has decreased, as has their life expectancy (Munitz, 1976; Cole, 1976), the job is becoming more difficult, more demanding, and less attractive (Keegan, 1975). Not only does systematic evaluation provide the administrative staff with the opportunity to share with the president their perceptions of the role of the president and to evaluate his performance, in light of those perceptions, but it also involves the president in a personal performance analysis, that can help him to define more clearly the goals of his office as well as his personal goals. Although a difficult process to go through, a good evaluation is likely to result in a stronger, more effective president (Hayes, 1976), for it can be a vehicle through which various interests and concerns of the college can surface and be brought to the attention of the president.

Another reason for a periodic review of presidential performance is the shift in roles and responsibilities of the presidency, and the little time and opportunity that the chief executive officer of an academic institution has, to explore openly the impact of these changes upon the administration of the college. There are few clear tests of presidential performance (Clark Kerr, 1972). As Cohen and March (1974) suggest, difficulties with finding indicators of success seem to be "generic to high level administrative positions - particularly . . . the academic presidency."

Formal evaluation can provide a permanent forum for the exchange of ideas and strategies for educational leadership (Munitz, 1975), a structured mechanism

which allows for quantitative and judgmental statements concerning the performance of the president to be made, a place where constituents of the institution can provide much needed response to the president's stewardship. Most important, this kind of two-way communication in assessing administrative performance ensures that everyone on the administrative team is operating under the same assumptions.

Evaluation can provide an institution with the opportunity to review the office of the presidency - to delineate more carefully the roles, responsibilities, and expectations for its chief administrative officer. This kind of a presidential profile, or statement of mission and role requirements for the presidency, will prove to be extremely useful in the selection of future presidents. Recent literature supports a closer relationship between the presidential selection and evaluation process, and the need to develop such institutionally-oriented criteria references (Munitz, 1976).

Periodic analysis of management practices can be considered inservice education for the person who is often insulated from the informal communication networks within the institution, and often the last one to know how well it is thought he is performing as chief executive officer. The provocation may be evaluation, but the essence of a successful review process is mutual education, "information transmission," and an understanding of each others roles, for both the president and his staff (Munitz, 1977).

In addition to the value of periodic evaluation to the president and his administrative team, the evaluation of the president can foster institutional growth and development. Munitz, in his Workbook for Chief Executives and Governing Boards (1977), suggests the matching of the pattern of success and problem areas of presidential leadership with the major challenges confronting the institution. The resulting mandate for change can be translated easily into future goals and objectives for the college and its chief executive officer.

BASIC GROUND RULES

Evaluation is a highly sensitive area of personnel management. Even if the primary purpose of the evaluation is not to retain or to dismiss, as it should not be, extreme care should be taken by the institution, and by the persons responsible for developing and implementing the process, to incorporate into their evaluation of the president, the following guidelines:

1) Evaluation should be used for performance improvement , for diagnosis, and treatment; not to rid an institution of a president. It should be growth-oriented, directed toward enhancing competencies.

2) The purpose of a presidential assessment should be developed by the president, in concert with his administrative staff, and should be stated clearly and succinctly in the evaluative instrument. In this way, the process will not be misconstrued, and the evaluators will know how the evaluation will be used. One of the best ways to destroy the credibility of an evaluation system is to use it for purposes not intended nor clearly understood by the evaluators.

3) Evaluation should be grounded in the history and philosophy of the institution, and should reflect its operational pattern.

4) Evaluation should be carried out in response to agreed upon criteria and standards of measures. This criteria should reflect only those activities which the administrative staff or the evaluators have had an opportunity to observe and the competency to judge.

5) Careful consideration should be taken to select criteria that is appropriate to the individual institution. This assessment criteria should be used as a framework upon which an evaluation instrument can be based.

6) Although very difficult to do, it is important to separate institutional evaluation from the evaluation of presidential performance. Efforts should be made to ascertain the quality of performance of the individual as opposed to the functions of the office. As more of the college constituency is included in the evaluation process (for example, the faculty)*, this becomes more difficult to accomplish.

7) Implementation of an evaluation process should be preceded by a discussion of the purposes of evaluation, the underlying assumptions, the limitations of such a process, and the anticipated concerns of the participants.

8) There should be basic agreement upon the evaluation model, the relevant groups who will participate, the methods to be used to solicit information, the question of anonymity, the time frame, and the cost of the evaluation process.

9) The results of the evaluation should be shared with the president, and he/she should be given the opportunity to respond to the findings.

10) A time schedule should be clearly outlined in the evaluation process.

11) Confidentiality should be maintained.

*See American Association of University Professors, "Faculty Participation in the Selection and Retention of Administrators" AAUP Bulletin, Winter 1974.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The selection of criteria to be used in the evaluation of the president is crucial to the entire evaluation process. Careful consideration must be given to the standard by which successful performance will be judged. As the role and the responsibilities of presidents have changed in the last few decades, so have the criteria for a successful presidency (Kerr, 1970). There must be an element of flexibility in the use of criteria as a reference for an evaluation, flexibility that takes into consideration the uniqueness of the individual as well as the institutional environment in which he/she works.

Assessment criteria should include performance criteria, but should also include other indices appropriate for presidential evaluation. These include the fostering of morale and creativity, the overall movement of the institution toward previously stated goals and objectives, maintenance of a healthy environment, and those personal qualities such as health, energy, integrity, openness, and intelligence, which are essential for a successful presidency.

Each criterion should be translated into a standard of measure, by which the president can be evaluated. This is to ensure that the basis for high and low ratings will be indicated clearly by the evaluator, and understood by the president. Standards of measure, as benchmarks, can also help to identify areas of needed attention, and can provide the basis for future development of personal goals and objectives.

Several documents are available which provide suggested criteria for evaluating the chief administrative officer. Drucker's (1967) suggestion of competencies in four areas - appropriating capital, people decisions, innovation, and planning is broad, and provides a backdrop against which more specific criteria might be developed.

Whatever criteria is used, they should reflect the culture and operation of the individual institution. The following is a list of criteria for evaluating the president of a large multi-campus community college. Many of the criteria have been drawn from the literature on administrative and presidential evaluation, and from examples of evaluation systems throughout the country, but the list in its entirety reflects the distinct and peculiar leadership needs of one multi-campus community college.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE PRESIDENT OF A MULTI-CAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

LEADERSHIP

1. evidence of an ability to articulate reality and provide a vision for the College.

2. evidence of a commitment to the one college concept, as well as the fostering of diversity among the individual campuses, along with appropriate flexibility.

3. maintenance of an atmosphere that encourages positive working conditions for the faculty and staff.

4. evidence of the ability to take presidential action when the circumstances warrant it.

5. existence in the College of models for establishing goals and objectives for administrative areas of responsibility.

6. maintenance of equal relationships among administrative staff.

7. existence of an atmosphere which encourages respect and dignity for all people.

8. evidence of the ability to act as a catalyst in moving the institution toward its agreed upon goals and objectives.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE PRESIDENT OF A MULTI-CAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ACADEMIC PLANNING AND INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION

1. existence of well developed and widely understood institutional goals and objectives.

2. existence of well developed and widely understood institutional policies and priorities.

3. existence of good academic program review procedures which serve as a basis for staff allocation and budgetary decisions.

4. existence of periodic procedure review to ensure maximum use of time and human resources.

5. evidence of careful and sound fiscal management, including the ability to allocate resources in a manner which achieves more efficient and effective resource utilization.

6. evidence of formal and informal mechanism for involving constituencies in the decision-making process.

7. evidence of ability to use institutional research component to enhance planning activities and the quality of decision.

8. works for consensus of Administrative Council on policy issues.

9. appropriate use of Administrative Council Meetings.

10. evidences ability to establish priorities in the daily routine.

DECISION-MAKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING

1. ability to identify and analyze issues confronting the institution, to perceive the multiple factors that affect major problem areas, and to articulate how fundamental decisions ultimately are made.

2. evidence of ability to comprehend the interrelated nature of such factors as budgeting, curriculum, social and political realities, group interests and pressures, laws and rules, and regulations having implication for the management of the institution.

3. ability to incorporate the ideas of others in decision-making.

4. ability to present and interpret ideas, information, and reasons for decisions, including the skills to acknowledge implications, devise strategies for implementation, assume responsibility, accept ambiguity, and recognize impacts upon others.

5. skill in involving, whenever appropriate, college groups and individuals in support of decisions and in their implementation.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE PRESIDENT OF A MULTI-CAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATION

1. ability to communicate and mobilize external constituencies for political and financial support.

2. skills in meeting the social and community obligation of the president of a community college.

3. evidence of working relationships with other community college presidents in the Community College System.

4. ability to relate to the legislators, the Chancellor of the System, other state agencies on matters affecting the College.

5. influential in the formation of external policies affecting the College.

6. evidence of the ability to take a stand on issues that relate to the College and to influence all the opinion molders in the community.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE PRESIDENT OF A MULTI-CAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PERSONNEL

1. evidences ability to select high quality subordinates and maintains credibility with them.

2. evidences ability to determine those issues which are the proper responsibility of subordinates and those which require presidential action.

3. evidences ability to delegate responsibility to subordinate managers, and provide latitude for their decision-making.

4. evidence of an effective ongoing procedure for evaluation of principal colleagues in the management team;

5. evidence of commitment to Affirmative Action policies and procedures.

6. accessibility to administrative colleagues.

7. delegates responsibility in ways that are consistent with staff growth.

8. relates well to classified staff.

9. sets an institutional tone and environment, conducive for student learning.

PERSONAL QUALITIES

These might include those personal attributes which make more easy the staff relating and communicating with the President, and the President communicating with his staff. Such qualities as health and appearance may also be included.

MODELS FOR EVALUATION

Various models for evaluating a president have been developed (Hancock, 1977), which include a variety of participants. The evaluator or the "decision-maker" is usually the Board of Trustees or the Chancellor of a system. This person or body is the final authority in the review process and has a major role in ensuring that the goals of the evaluation are met. For example, the Board of Trustees at SUNY developed a set of guidelines for the evaluation of the Chancellor and campus presidents. Each campus in the System, through its local Board of Trustees (the evaluator), developed presidential evaluation procedures, based on the guidelines from the State.

The "fact-finder" is the person or persons who will gather the information and may make recommendations to the decision-maker. This could be an evaluation committee, a single administrator, or an outside consultant. Hays (1976) and Munitz (1977) agree that outside consultants are of great value to the evaluation process.

> "The use of outside consultants provides expertise that most staffs do not have; they bring in a fresh external perspective and lend to the process, a greater degree of credibility than if it were a strictly internal affair" (Hays, 1976).

An outside consultant, as a facilitator, can also serve as a buffer between the evaluators and the evaluatee. He/she can provide assistance to the president in interpreting the evaluating responses, identifying weaknesses, and developing positive strategies for change. Finally, there are the "significant others" who are affected by the character and quality of the president's performance. They can provide substantive information and performance ratings, based on their observations and interaction with the president.

Other evaluation models that have been developed are "ad hoc committees," which have been used with success in the New York system, and proposed to Pennsylvania by G. Lester Anderson (1975). An extension of the search committee, the ad hoc committee develops an assessment portfolio, which includes a presidential self-assessment, statements of groups represented on the ad hoc committee, and the committee consensus judgement concerning the president. Salisbury State College uses an administrative effectiveness survey, which includes the President along with other key administrators at the College. This instrument seeks from the administrators, faculty, and the student population, an appraisal of administrative services at the College.

If the primary purpose of an evaluation of the president is the identification through evaluative feedback, of performance areas which need improvement or development, and not his retention or dismissal, another model seems appropriate. A less costly approach to presidential development, which can be very effective in stimulating analysis and assessment of presidential performance, and encourage growth and development of the individual while in office, is an internal evaluative feedback system. This system would allow the top administrative staff to assess the performance of the president to take stock of his present and potential strengths, and to comment, in a formalized and systematic way, on the success and direction of his stewardship. If properly developed and executed, this internal system can be as effective, if not a more effective tool than an evaluative system initiated by the Board of Trustees or the Chancellor. The strength of this model is in the formalization of the

THE PRESIDENTIAL SELF-ASSESSMENT

The uniqueness of the task, and the complexity of the job, make it extremely difficult to accurately assess the performance and effectiveness of the college president. His constituencies are diverse, and the competencies that a president must demonstrate over time are often overlapping and contradictory (G. Lester Anderson, 1975). Kerr (1970) suggested that even with the imprecise proofs of presidential performance that do exist, many become evident over the long run. To assess short range progress as well as long range success, several kinds of input, from multiple perspectives, must be sought. Presidential assessment, therefore, must be multi-faceted.

Included in a comprehensive evaluation of the president should be a presidential self-assessment. This would provide the president with an opportunity to reflect upon the direction of his stewardship, outside the context of day to day concerns. Self-assessment allows for reflection upon the goals that the president had set for the institution as well as personal performance goals, and an opportunity to assess his progress in reaching those goals. In addition, self-assessment gives the president an opportunity to share with his staff his perception of the role and responsibilities of his job, and to share the philosophical assumptions which underlie his educational leadership.

What often makes evaluation difficult is the misconception of the job. Too often, evaluation of a president is based on expectations which are not central to his actual responsibilities. Self-assessment can bridge that destructive gap between myth and reality, and enhance the understanding and knowledge of the presidency.

In a letter commenting on his own evaluation, President E. K. Fretwell of State University of New York College at Buffalo, wrote:

process, and the commitment by the President and his staff to consciously assess and collectively address problem areas in institutional leadership. In many ways, a formalized internal assessment and feedback system would be less threatening, and could result in better communication, a more open administrative operation, improved relations and a better informed and more effective institutional leader. If an external evaluation system were to be instituted by the governing body of the institution, this internal system could easily be adapted to meet additional guidelines or criteria as developed by the Board of Trustees or the Chancellor. The internal evaluation would be a part of the President's "assessment portfolio."

" . . . the evaluation process encourages one to set about a rather and introspective assessment of personal goals, resulting, in greater self knowledge. In a more pragmatic sense, the evaluation enables the members of the campus community to voice their assessment of the stewardship of the chief administrative officer. This is an experience that produces a greater sense of consciousness of the institution and of its progress toward its mission among its constituencies, and that provides the president with a more or less objective measure of his progress. The final analysis may be humbling or reassuring, but the end result is a positive one, leading to greater commitment to institutional and personal goals" (1977).

Self-assessment can be done in a variety of ways, and should reflect the president's personal preference in style and format. It can be a narrative, in which the president would include:

1) a summary of expectations or goals at the time of his coming to the position, the changes that have occurred which brought about a modification of these goals, and his success in reaching these goals;
2) an analysis of his administrative style;
3) a profile of the major issues confronting the administration of the institution, and improvements that could be made, which would address these issues in the most effective and efficient manner;
4) statements of administrative goals and expectations along with strategies the president proposes to use to achieve these goals during the next evaluation cycle.

Another approach to self-assessment is to provide the president with a set of criteria upon which he will be evaluated, and ask him to rate himself, in similar fashion to the way he will be evaluated by various college constituencies. J. Jefferson Bennett, President of the University of the South (1977), in his self-evaluation, reacted to a list of criteria upon which it had been determined, by the Board of Trustees, that he would be evaluated. Initially, he was asked to list, using the criteria, in order of importance, the priorities of his job. This, he said, gave him the opportunity to reflect and look honestly at his perception of the job. Secondly, Dr. Bennett was asked to grade himself on a scale of 75 - 100. Finally, the Board of Trustees and the top administrative staff evaluated him, using the same criteria. Together, the Board, the top administrative staff, and the President were able to identify areas where the level of performance could be improved.

RATING SCALES

Rating scales are devices to assist the evaluator in his attempt to give an approximate appraisal of administrative behavior. Statistically reliable and valid rating scales are the most common ingredient of on-going programs in administrator evaluation (Farmer, 1977). Rating scales offer several advantages, but care must be taken that their use does not result in haphazard guessing or that they reduce the evaluation process to a popularity poll. Rating scales provide structured input, which allows for rapid and systematic classification of summary information from various sources. They allow for anonymity and confidentiality. A good assessment instrument would include both a rating scale, which can cover a breadth of administrative qualities and performance activities, along with an opportunity for the evaluator to write some narrative feedback.

Rating scales should be developed from the agreed upon criteria for improving the definition and the evaluation of presidential performance. A crucial task for those developing a rating scale is the selection of particular metaphor and roles that seem best to describe their institution and presidency. Rating scales should not be overly complex, nor require an extensive amount of time. Such a scale as that suggested by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (Surwill and Heywood, 1976), which allows the rater to omit ratings and to indicate that the standard of measure is not applicable, is desirable.

Where possible, the standard of measure used in the rating scale should be stated in behavioral terms, in order to discourage an attitudinal survey. Attitudinal surveys can cloud the issue of performance and success. Of course, a presidential

evaluation should go beyond the assessment of performance to include qualities of the individual which make for a successful manager/administrator but suggestions for improvemen., which can be translated into specific behavior modification, will serve well the purpose of the assessment.

Whatever assessment model is used in a presidential evaluation, it must have as its primary purpose the development and improvement of the individual administrator. There must be mutual faith that the two groups (the evaluators and the evaluatee) are working toward the same goal - improved presidential performance, for the benefit of the president as well as the enhancement of the college administrative operation. As Genova, et al., (1976) states, "Mutual benefit is not, however, an automatic outcome of . . . administrator evaluation, but rather the result of careful and guided planning by all of the constituencies involved." If a mutual trust is not developed, the assessment of the president will fail, no matter how sensitively structured the evaluative instrument, or skillfully administered the program. In addition, there must be an agreement among the participants that the results of the review will be taken seriously, and that once identified, areas of performance weakness will be addressed. If this is not interwoven into the fabric of the evaluation process, there can be little hope of success. As Munitz (1976) suggests, there is a real danger in driving our finest people away by crude assessment devices. The challenge is to create a process which will identify weakness as well as strengths, and strengthen the person in office. If this cannot be done, an entirely different mechanism must be developed to graciously exit the person from the office.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Rights and Responsibilities of College Presidents, Washington, D.C., May 6, 1970.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. The Changing Role of the College Presidency, Essays on Governance. Washington, D.C. April, 1974.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Challenges of the Presidency, Papers from the Fifth Biennial Summer Council of Presidents. Washington, D.C.: July 6-10, 1975.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Guidelines for Conditions of Employment for Colleges and University Presidents. Washington, D.C.: November, 1975.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Guidelines for Conditions of Employment for Colleges and University Presidents. Washington, D.C. : November, 1975.

American Association of University Professors. "Faculty Participation in the Selection and Retention of Administrators." AAUP Bulletin, Winter, 1974.

Anderson, Lester G., The Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes, and Outcomes. The Pennsylvania State University, 1975.

Auburn, Norman P. "The University President - Mission Impossible." Educational Record, Spring, 1971, 52.

Berquist, David. "Performance of College Presidents." Intellect, February, 1974 102,2335, pp. 315-317.

Bolman, Frederick de W. How College Presidents Are Chosen. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Cohen, Arthur, Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March, Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw Hill, 1974.

Cole, Charles C. Jr., "The Reeling Presidency." Educational Record, Spring, 1976, 52,2, pp. 71.

College Presidents: "They Too Must Pass The Test," The New York Times, Sunday, January 28, 1973.

Dobbins, Charles G. and Thomas M. Stauffer, "Academic Administrators - Born or Made?" Educational Record 53, Fall, 1972: pp. 293-99. American Council on Education.

Dodds, Harold W., The Academic President Educator or Caretaker. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.

Dressel, Paul Leroy, Handbook of Academic Evaluation, Assessing Institutional Effectiveness, Student Progress, and Professional Performance for Decision Making in Higher Education. San Franscisco: Jossey - Bass Publishers, 1976.

Drucker, Peter, The Effective Executive, New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Edwards, Charles W., and James W. Pruyne, The Administrator in Higher Education: An Assessment of Professional Needs. Normal, Illinois: Planning and Change, Illinois State University, and the University Council for Educational Administration, 1976.

Ehrle, Elwood B., "Selection and Evaluation of Department Chairmen." Educational Record, Winter, 1975, 52, pp. 29-38.

Elbert, Arthur J., The University Presidency: Dimensions of Performance. Unpublished dissertation, n.d.

Farmer, Charles H., "Current Practices in Administrator Evaluation." Paper presented at the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges/ American Association for Higher Education's Conference on the Evaluation and Development of Administrators, February 2, 1977, Airlie House, Virginia, mimeographed.

------, "The Inplications of Evaluation." Paper presented at the American Association of University Administrators' Seminar on Administrative Evaluation, November 19, 1976, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, mimeographed.

Fenker, Richard M., "The Evaluation of University Faculty and Administers: A Case Study." Journal of Higher Education, November/December, 1975, 46, pp. 665-86.

Ferrari, Michael, R., Profiles of the American College President. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1970.

Fisher, Charles, "The Evaluation and Development of College and University Administrators." Eric/Higher Education Research Currents, March, 1977 pp. 3-6.

------, "The Evaluation and Development of College and University Administrators, Part Two: Professional Development of Administrators." Eric/Higher Education Research Currents. June, 1977, pp. 3-6.

Foresi, Joseph, Jr., Administrative Leadership in the Community College. Jericho, New York: Exposition Press, 1974.

Genoua, George, Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976.

Gross, Richard F., "Facilitating Administrator Development." Paper presented at the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges/American Association for Higher Education is Conference on Evaluation and Development of Administrators, February 2, 1977, Airlie House, Virginia, mimeographed.

Hancock, Judith, "The Presidential Study, The Evaluation of a President: Selected Bibliography." New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, 1975, mimeographed.

Hancock, Judith, "The Academic Presidency: A selected Bibliography of Sources, 1960-1974." New Brunswick, New Jersey, Rutgers University, 1975, mimeographed.

Hanley, Dexter L. S.J. "Evaluating A President." AGB Reports, March/April, 1975, 17, pp. 42-47.

Harvey, James L., Managing Colleges and Universities by Objectives. Wheaton, Illinois: Ireland. Educational Corporation, 1976.

Hays, Garry D., "Evaluating a President, the Minnesota Plan." AGB Reports, September/October, 1976, pp.9.

------, "Evaluating a President: Criteria and Procedures." AGB Reports, November/December 1976, pp.41.

Hesburg, Theodore M. "Presidential Leadership." Journal of Higher Education, December, 1971, 42, pp. 763-65.

Hillway, Tyrus, "Evaluating College and University Administration." Intellect, April, 1973, 101, pp. 426-27.

------, Rating Scale for Academic Administration. Revised edition copyright, 1975.

Ingraham, Mark Hoyt, The Mirror of Brass: The Compensation and Working Conditions of College and University Administrators. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Johnson, Archie B., "Evaluation of Administrators". Paper presented at the American Association of University Administrators' Regional Workshop in Mobile, Alabama, February 3, 1977, mimeographed.

Kauffman, Joseph F., The Selection of College and University Presidents. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974.

-------, "The New College President: Expectations and Realities." Educational Record 58, Apring, 1977: pp. 146-68. American Council on Education.

Kerr, Clark, "Presidential Discontent." in Perspectives on Campus Tension. Ed. Donald C. Nichols. Papers prepared for the Special Committee on Campus Tensions, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970, pp. 137-62.

Kerr, Clark, The Uses of the University - with a Postscript, 1972. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Koontz, Harold, "Holding the CEO Accountable." Hospital Progress, September, 1976.

Lahti, Robert, "Developing Leadership for the Management of Higher Education" College and University Business, May, 1970.

------, "Goal-oriented Evaluation for Educational Managers." Phi Delta Kaddan, 54, March, 1973, pp. 491.

Longo, John Mark, "A Study of the Relationship between Presidential and Constituency perceptions of selected college presidential personality factors and continuing judgements of presidential leadership." Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, New York University, 1976.

MacVittie, Robert W. , "Trustees and the Evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer." Paper presented at the New York State Regents' Annual Meeting, New York, New York, March 13, 1975.

Mayhew, Lewis B., "Emerging Concepts of the Presidency." Journal of Higher Education, May, 1971, 42, pp. 356-67.

McKenna, David L., "Recycling College Presidents." Liberal Education, December, 1972, LVII, 4, pp. 456-63.

Miller, Richard, Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Franscisco: Jossey Bass, 1975.

Morgan, Don A., Perspectives of the Community College Presidency. Occasional Report Number 14. Los Angeles, California: University of California, 1970.

------, "The Junior College President: Role and Responsibilities." in The Junior College President. Occasional Report Number 13. Ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles, California: University of California, May, 1969, pp. 19-31.

Munitz, Barry, "Presidential Evaluation: An Assessment of Institutional Leadership" Paper presented at the American Association of University Administrators' Seminar on Administrative Evaluation, March, 1977, Mobile, Alabama, mimeographed.

Munitz, Barry, The Assessment of Institutional Leadership: A workbook for Chief Executive Officers and Governing Boards. To be published.

Norvall, Robert C., "The Evaluation of College Administrators: Where Are We Now." Paper presented at Pennsylvania Association of Student Personnel Administration Conference, October, 1975.

Parkinson, C. Northcote, "On The Making of a College President." Think, September/October, 1970: 2-4 I.B.M.

Pay, C.P., "Thoughts On Evaluation in Higher Education, Essays on Education," No. 1, Iowa City: The American Educational Testing Program, 1972

Phipps, Ronald A., "The Evaluation of Administrators" Paper presented for American Association of University Administrators' Seminar on Administrative Evaluation, November, 1976, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, mimeographed.

Pullias, Earl V., "Ten Principles of College Administration." School and Society, February, 1972.

------, "College and University Administration, Ten More Principles." Intellect, March, 1973, 101, pp. 428-31.

Rowland, Virgil K., Evaluating and Improving Managerial Performance. New York, New York: McGraw Hill, 1970.

Salmen, Stanley, Duties of Administrators in Higher Education. New York: MacMillian, 1971.

Semans, Philip W., "The Perilous Presidencies." Chronicle of Higher Education, February 3, 1975, p.1, 4.

Shragge, Phil, "Evaluation of Community College Administrators." Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: April, 1977. Mimeographed.

State University of New York. Guidelines for the Review Process for the Chancellor and Presidents. November 26, 1975.

Stokes, Harold W., The American College President. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Surwell, Benedict and Stanley Heywood. Evaluation of College and University Top Brass: The State of the Art, Status Report of AASCU Member Institutions. Washington, D.C. : American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1977.

Van de Visse, Martin, "The Evaluation of Administrative Performance in Higher Education: A Survey of Organizational Practices In Public and Private Institutions of Ohio." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Kent State University, 1974.

Wells, Herman, "How To Succeed As a University President Without Really Trying" Educational Record, 1969, 15, pp. 241-45.

Whisler, Thomas L. and Shirley F. Harper, eds. Performance Appraisal. New York: Holt, Rhienhart, and Winston, 1962.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 4 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES